A new property of dual bases and its application

Przemysław Gospodarczyk*, Paweł Woźny

Institute of Computer Science, University of Wrocław, ul. Joliot-Curie 15, 50-383 Wrocław, Poland

arXiv:1511.08264v1 [math.NA] 24 Nov 2015

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a new property of dual bases. Let there be given a dual basis D_{n+1} for a basis $B_{n+1} := \{b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_{n+1}\}$ of the linear space $\mathcal{B}_{n+1} := \operatorname{span} B_{n+1}$ with an inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. A dual basis D_n for the basis $B_n := B_{n+1} \setminus \{b_{n+1}\}$ of the linear space $\mathcal{B}_n := \operatorname{span} B_n$ with respect to the same inner product can be computed quickly using a new formula connecting the dual functions from D_{n+1} and D_n. The presented algorithm, along with the methods given in (P. Woźny, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 260 (2014), 301–311), can be used to solve efficiently the problem of degree reduction of Bézier curves with box constraints, which has been proposed recently in (P. Gospodarczyk, Computer-Aided Design 62 (2015), 143–151).

Keywords: dual bases, Bézier curves, degree reduction, box constraints, restricted area, constrained least squares approximation.

1. Introduction

A *dual basis* $D_n := \left\{ d_0^{(n)}, d_1^{(n)}, \ldots, d_n^{(n)} \right\}$ for a basis $B_n := \{b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ of the linear space $\mathcal{B}_n := \operatorname{span} B_n$ satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{span} D_n = \mathcal{B}_n, \\ \left\langle b_i, d_j^{(n)} \right\rangle = \delta_{ij} \quad (i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n), \end{cases}$$

where δ_{ij} equals 1 if $i = j$, and 0 otherwise; $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : \mathcal{B}_n \times \mathcal{B}_n \to \mathbb{C}$ is an *inner product*; and $d_j^{(n)}$ $(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ are called *dual functions*.

Now, we present some well-known facts about dual bases (see, e.g., [22, Section 1]).

Fact 1.1. *Every $f_n \in \mathcal{B}_n$ can be written in the following way:*

$$f_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left\langle f_n, d_i^{(n)} \right\rangle b_i.$$

Fact 1.2. *Given a function g,*

$$f_n^* = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \left\langle g, d_i^{(n)} \right\rangle b_i$$

is the best least squares approximation of g in the space $\mathcal{B}_n$, i.e.,

$$\|g - f_n^*\|_2 = \min_{f_n \in \mathcal{B}_n} \|g - f_n\|_2,$$

where $\| \cdot \|_2 := \sqrt{\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle}$ denotes the least squares norm.

*Corresponding author. Fax +48 71 3757801

Email addresses: pgo@ii.uni.wroc.pl (Przemysław Gospodarczyk), Pawel.Wozny@ii.uni.wroc.pl (Paweł Woźny)

Recently, dual bases with their applications in numerical analysis and CAGD have been extensively studied. *Dual Bernstein polynomials* (see, e.g., [3, 10, 14]) have found their application in the algorithm of computing roots of polynomials (see [1]), degree reduction of Bézier curves (see [7, 18, 25]), merging of Bézier curves (see [24]) and polynomial approximation of rational Bézier curves (see [16]). For the algorithms concerning Bézier surfaces, see [15] and the list of references given there. In [23], one can find some results on *dual B-spline functions*. Paper [9] deals with the construction of *dual B-spline functionals*. *Dual polynomial bases* were studied in [5]. Dual basis functions in subspaces of inner product spaces were discussed in [11]. As for the properties of dual bases in general, see [22, 23].

In this paper, we present a new property of dual bases. Suppose that a dual basis D_{n+1} for a basis B_{n+1} of the space $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ is given. A dual basis D_n for the basis B_n of the space $\mathcal{B}_n$ with the same inner product can be computed efficiently using a new relation between the dual functions from D_{n+1} and D_n. The given algorithm can find some important applications, e.g., in CAGD and numerical analysis.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the methods presented in [23]. The new property of dual bases is given in Section 3. The algorithms from Sections 2 and 3 can be used, e.g., to solve efficiently the problem of *degree reduction of Bézier curves with box constraints*, which has been considered recently in [6]. We explain this application in Section 4 and give some examples in Section 5. Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Construction of dual bases – earlier work

Suppose that B_n is the given basis of the space $\mathcal{B}_n$ and the dual basis D_n with respect to the inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is known as well. In [23], one of us proposed an efficient method of constructing the dual basis

$$D_{n+1} := \left\{ d_0^{(n+1)}, d_1^{(n+1)}, \ldots, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\}$$

for $B_{n+1} := B_n \cup \{b_{n+1}\}$. See also the previous method given in [22]. Further on in this section, we recall the connection between D_n and D_{n+1} as well as the algorithm of constructing D_{n+1}.

Theorem 2.1 ([23]). *The dual functions from D_n and D_{n+1} are related in the following way:*

$$d_i^{(n+1)} = d_i^{(n)} - w_i^{(n+1)} d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, n), \tag{2.1}$$

where

$$w_i^{(n+1)} := \left\langle d_i^{(n)}, b_{n+1} \right\rangle. \tag{2.2}$$

As a result of Theorem 2.1, each dual function $d_i^{(n+1)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ depends on $d_i^{(n)}$ which is known, and on $d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}$ which must be computed. Note that $\operatorname{span} B_{n+1} = \operatorname{span} (D_n \cup \{b_{n+1}\})$. Therefore, we can write

$$d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} = \sum_{h=0}^{n} c_h^{(n+1)} d_h^{(n)} + c_{n+1}^{(n+1)} b_{n+1}, \tag{2.3}$$

and solve the following system of linear equations:

$$\left.\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left\langle d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, b_i \right\rangle = c_i^{(n+1)} + c_{n+1}^{(n+1)} v_i^{(n+1)} \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, n), \\ 1 &= \left\langle d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, b_{n+1} \right\rangle = \sum_{h=0}^{n} c_h^{(n+1)} w_h^{(n+1)} + c_{n+1}^{(n+1)} v_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$v_j^{(n+1)} := \langle b_{n+1}, b_j \rangle \qquad (j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1), \tag{2.5}$$

for the coefficients $c_0^{(n+1)}, c_1^{(n+1)}, \ldots, c_{n+1}^{(n+1)}$. According to [23, Section 2], the solution is simple, namely

$$c_{n+1}^{(n+1)} = \left(v_{n+1}^{(n+1)} - \sum_{h=0}^{n} v_h^{(n+1)} w_h^{(n+1)} \right)^{-1}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$c_h^{(n+1)} = -v_h^{(n+1)} c_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \qquad (h = 0, 1, \ldots, n). \tag{2.7}$$

Corollary 2.2 ([23])**.** Let $f_n^* \in \mathcal{B}_n$ be the best least squares approximation of a function g in the space $\mathcal{B}_n$, i.e.,

$$\|g - f_n^*\|_2 = \min_{f_n \in \mathcal{B}_n} \|g - f_n\|_2, \tag{2.8}$$

where

$$f_n^* = \sum_{i=0}^{n} e_i^{(n)} b_i \tag{2.9}$$

with $e_i^{(n)} := \left\langle g, d_i^{(n)} \right\rangle$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ (see Fact 1.2). Suppose that we know the coefficients $e_i^{(n)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ and our goal is to compute the optimal element $f_{n+1}^* \in \mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ for the same function g. Observe that Fact 1.2, along with the formulas (2.1) and (2.3), yields the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{n+1}^{(n+1)} &= \sum_{h=0}^{n} \overline{c_h^{(n+1)}} e_h^{(n)} + \overline{c_{n+1}^{(n+1)}} \langle g, b_{n+1} \rangle, \\ e_i^{(n+1)} &= e_i^{(n)} - \overline{w_i^{(n+1)}} e_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, n), \end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where $\overline{z}$ is the complex conjugate of $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

Remark 2.3. Note that in [23, p. 304], the system (2.4) and its solution are slightly different. This is due to the fact that the author considered $\left\langle b_j, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle$ instead of $\left\langle d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, b_j \right\rangle$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1$, and then forgot to use the complex conjugate of the coefficients $c_j^{(n+1)}$ $(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1)$. Moreover, in [23, (2.12)], the author omitted the complex conjugate of the coefficients $c_j^{(n+1)}$ $(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1)$ and $w_i^{(n+1)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ (cf. (2.10)). However, the formulas given in [23] are correct for a *real-valued inner product*.

The above-described idea is summarized in the following algorithm.

Algorithm 2.4 ([23])**.** *[$D_n \Longrightarrow D_{n+1}$]*

Input: $D_n = \left\{ d_0^{(n)}, d_1^{(n)}, \ldots, d_n^{(n)} \right\}$, $B_{n+1} = \{b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_{n+1}\}$

Output: $D_{n+1} = \left\{ d_0^{(n+1)}, d_1^{(n+1)}, \ldots, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\}$

`Step 1.` *Compute* $w_i^{(n+1)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ *by* (2.2).

`Step 2.` *Compute* $v_j^{(n+1)}$ $(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1)$ *by* (2.5).

`Step 3.` *Compute* $c_{n+1}^{(n+1)}$ *by* (2.6).

`Step 4.` *Compute* $c_h^{(n+1)}$ $(h = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ *by* (2.7).

`Step 5.` *Compute* $d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}$ *by* (2.3).

`Step 6.` *Compute* $d_i^{(n+1)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$ *by* (2.1).

`Step 7.` *Return the dual basis* $\left\{ d_0^{(n+1)}, d_1^{(n+1)}, \ldots, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\}$.

The next algorithm computes a sequence of dual bases $D_0, D_1, \ldots, D_N$.

Algorithm 2.5 ([23]). *[Construction of dual bases $D_0, D_1, \ldots, D_N$]*

Input: $B_n = \{b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n\}$ $(n = 0, 1, \ldots, N)$

Output: $D_n = \left\{d_0^{(n)}, d_1^{(n)}, \ldots, d_n^{(n)}\right\}$ $(n = 0, 1, \ldots, N)$

Step 1. *Set* $D_0 := \left\{\langle b_0, b_0\rangle^{-1} b_0\right\}$.

Step 2. *Compute* D_n $(n = 1, 2, \ldots, N)$ *using Algorithm 2.4.*

Step 3. *Return the dual bases* $D_0, D_1, \ldots, D_N$.

3. A new property of dual bases

In this section, we prove that for the given dual basis $D_{n+1} = \left\{d_0^{(n+1)}, d_1^{(n+1)}, \ldots, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}\right\}$, it is possible to compute efficiently the dual basis $D_n = \left\{d_0^{(n)}, d_1^{(n)}, \ldots, d_n^{(n)}\right\}$. Clearly, one can try to rewrite the formula (2.1). However, note that each coefficient $w_i^{(n+1)}$ depends on the searched dual function $d_i^{(n)}$ (see (2.2)). To avoid this issue, we must find a different formula for the coefficients $w_i^{(n+1)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$.

In order to prove the main result, we will need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *The following identity holds:*

$$\left\langle d_i^{(n)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle = 0 \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, n). \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. We use Fact 1.1 to represent each dual function $d_i^{(n)}$ as a linear combination of the elements $b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n$,

$$d_i^{(n)} = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \left\langle d_i^{(n)}, d_j^{(n)} \right\rangle b_j.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\langle d_i^{(n)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle &= \left\langle \sum_{j=0}^{n} \left\langle d_i^{(n)}, d_j^{(n)} \right\rangle b_j, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{n} \left\langle d_i^{(n)}, d_j^{(n)} \right\rangle \left\langle b_j, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle = 0 \end{aligned}$$

since $\left\langle b_j, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle = 0$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. □

Theorem 3.2. *The connection between the dual functions from D_n and D_{n+1} is as follows:*

$$d_i^{(n)} = d_i^{(n+1)} + w_i^{(n+1)} d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, n), \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$w_i^{(n+1)} := -\frac{\left\langle d_i^{(n+1)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle}{\left\langle d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle} \tag{3.3}$$

(cf. Theorem 2.1).

Proof. Obviously, the relation (3.2) follows from (2.1). Now, we substitute (3.2) into the equation (3.1) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left\langle d_i^{(n+1)} + w_i^{(n+1)} d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle \\ &= \left\langle d_i^{(n+1)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle + w_i^{(n+1)} \left\langle d_{n+1}^{(n+1)}, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the formula (3.3) follows. □

Corollary 3.3. Let $f_{n+1}^* \in \mathcal{B}_{n+1}$ be the best least squares approximation of a function g in the space $\mathcal{B}_{n+1}$, i.e.,

$$\|g - f_{n+1}^*\|_2 = \min_{f_{n+1} \in \mathcal{B}_{n+1}} \|g - f_{n+1}\|_2,$$

where

$$f_{n+1}^* = \sum_{j=0}^{n+1} e_j^{(n+1)} b_j$$

with $e_j^{(n+1)} := \left\langle g, d_j^{(n+1)} \right\rangle$ for $j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1$ (see Fact 1.2). Suppose that we know the coefficients $e_j^{(n+1)}$ $(j = 0, 1, \ldots, n+1)$ and our goal is to compute the optimal element $f_n^* \in \mathcal{B}_n$ for the same function g (see (2.8), (2.9)). Observe that Fact 1.2, along with the formula (3.2), yields the following relation:

$$e_i^{(n)} = e_i^{(n+1)} + \overline{w_i^{(n+1)}} e_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$$

(cf. Corollary 2.2).

Remark 3.4. In contrast to (2.2), the formula (3.3) is independent of $d_i^{(n)}$ $(i = 0, 1, \ldots, n)$. Therefore, it can be used to compute the dual basis D_n, under the assumption that the dual basis D_{n+1} is given. See the following algorithm.

Algorithm 3.5. *$[D_{n+1} \Longrightarrow D_n]$*

Input: $D_{n+1} = \left\{ d_0^{(n+1)}, d_1^{(n+1)}, \ldots, d_{n+1}^{(n+1)} \right\}$

Output: $D_n = \left\{ d_0^{(n)}, d_1^{(n)}, \ldots, d_n^{(n)} \right\}$

`Step 1.` *For $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$,*

(i) *compute $w_i^{(n+1)}$ by (3.3);*

(ii) *compute $d_i^{(n)}$ by (3.2).*

`Step 2.` *Return the dual basis* $\left\{ d_0^{(n)}, d_1^{(n)}, \ldots, d_n^{(n)} \right\}$.

Remark 3.6. Suppose that a dual basis of a certain space is well-known or was computed earlier. In CAGD, we often look for an optimal element (in the least squares sense) which is *constrained*, e.g., by some continuity conditions. As a result, we need a dual basis of a specific subspace of the well-known space. Algorithm 3.5 can be particularly useful in those situations. For example, see Section 4.

4. Application in degree reduction of Bézier curves

In this section, we solve the problem of *degree reduction of Bézier curves*, i.e., we approximate an original Bézier curve with a different one of lower degree. In order to do that efficiently, we use the algorithms presented in Sections 2 and 3.

4.1. Problem of degree reduction of Bézier curves

Conventional degree reduction of Bézier curves is to minimize a chosen error function subject to some continuity constraints at the endpoints. Such a procedure can be used in *data exchange*, *data compression* and *data comparison*. Therefore, degree reduction of Bézier curves is an important problem in CAGD. In the past 30 years, the conventional approach to this problem has been extensively studied (see, e.g., [2, 4, 7, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 25] and the lists of references given there). As a result of this common strategy, one may obtain control points which are located far away from the plot of the curve. Consequently, further editing of the resulting curve may be difficult. In addition, the *convex hull property* of the curve is useless in some practical applications. For details, see [6, Section 2].

In [6], one of us has proposed the so-called *restricted area approach* to the problem of degree reduction of Bézier curves. Constraints of a new type eliminate the issue which arises in the case of the conventional approach. As we shall see, the theory given in the previous sections can be used to solve the problem more efficiently than in [6]. Moreover, note that the same idea can be applied to the problem of merging of Bézier curves with box constraints (see [8]).

Now, we recall the problem formulated in [6]. Let Π_n^2 denote the space of all parametric polynomials in $\mathbb{R}^2$ of degree at most n. Further on in this paper, we assume that $\|\cdot\|$ is the Euclidean vector norm in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Problem 4.1. *[Degree reduction of Bézier curves with box constraints]*
Let there be given a Bézier curve $P_n \in \Pi_n^2$,

$$P_n(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{n} p_i B_i^n(t) \qquad (0 \le t \le 1),$$

where $p_i := (p_i^x, p_i^y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ *are called* control points, *and* n *is the* degree *of the curve. Here*

$$B_i^n(t) := \binom{n}{i} t^i (1-t)^{n-i} \qquad (0 \le i \le n)$$

are Bernstein polynomials of degree n. *Find a Bézier curve* $R_m \in \Pi_m^2$ *of lower degree* m,

$$R_m(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{m} r_i B_i^m(t) \qquad (0 \le t \le 1;\ m < n),$$

satisfying the following conditions:

(i) value of the least squares error

$$E \equiv \|P_n - R_m\|_2 := \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^{N} \|P_n(t_k) - R_m(t_k)\|^2} \tag{4.1}$$

is minimized, where $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^N$ $(N \in \mathbb{N})$ *is a given strictly increasing sequence whose elements are in the interval* $[0, 1]$*;*

(ii) P_n *and* R_m *are* $C^{\alpha,\beta}$-continuous *(*$\alpha, \beta \ge -1$ *and* $\alpha + \beta < m - 1$*) at the endpoints, i.e.,*

$$\left.\begin{aligned} P_n^{(i)}(0) &= R_m^{(i)}(0) \qquad (i = 0, 1, \ldots, \alpha), \\ P_n^{(j)}(1) &= R_m^{(j)}(1) \qquad (j = 0, 1, \ldots, \beta); \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{4.2}$$

(iii) control points $r_i := (r_i^x, r_i^y)$ $(\alpha < i < m - \beta)$ *are located inside the specified rectangular area, including edges of the rectangle, i.e., the following* box constraints *are fulfilled:*

$$l_z \le r_i^z \le u_z \qquad (i = \alpha + 1, \alpha + 2, \ldots, m - \beta - 1;\ z = x, y), \tag{4.3}$$

where $l_x, l_y, u_x, u_y \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 4.2. Further on in this paper, the minimization of (4.1), with the conditions (4.2), but without the box constraints (4.3) is called the *traditional degree reduction*.

First, recall that the continuity conditions (4.2) imply the well-known formulas [6, (3.4)] and [6, (3.5)] for the control points $r_0, r_1, \ldots, r_\alpha$ and $r_m, r_{m-1}, \ldots, r_{m-\beta}$, respectively. Moreover, Problem 4.1 can be solved in a componentwise way. Therefore, it is sufficient to explain how to compute $r^x_{\alpha+1}, r^x_{\alpha+2}, \ldots, r^x_{m-\beta-1}$ (see [6, Remark 3.3]).

In [6, Section 5], one can find step by step instructions on how to solve the problem using *BVLS algorithm (bounded-variable least-squares)* [19]. This iterative *active-set method* is modelled on *NNLS algorithm (non-negative least-squares)* [13]. The main computational cost of a single iteration of the algorithm is associated with solving the so-called *subproblem* (see [6, Section 5, Step 3]). Consequently, further research can focus on finding fast methods of solving the subproblem.

4.2. Efficient method of solving the subproblem

Now, we formulate the subproblem and describe how to solve it efficiently, using the properties of dual bases.

First, we define set $\mathcal{C} := \{0, 1, \ldots, \alpha, m-\beta, m-\beta+1, \ldots, m\}$. Notice that it contains indices of variables which are already computed thanks to the continuity conditions (4.2). Let $\mathcal{F}_i$ be a set of indices of variables satisfying strict version of inequalities (4.3) before solving the subproblem in ith iteration. Furthermore, we assume that sets $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{U}_i$ contain indices of variables which, before solving the subproblem in ith iteration, have the minimum and maximum permissible value, respectively (cf. (4.3)).

In ith iteration, the subproblem is formulated as follows.

Problem 4.3. *[ith subproblem]*
Find the optimal values of variables (i.e., coordinates of the control points) whose indices are in set $\mathcal{F}_i$ subject to the fixed values of variables whose indices are in set $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{L}_i \cup \mathcal{U}_i$. More precisely, we look for $\psi_i^* \in \Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_i}$ such that:

$$\|\varphi_i - \psi_i^*\|_2 = \min_{\psi_i \in \Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_i}} \|\varphi_i - \psi_i\|_2, \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$\Pi_m^{\mathcal{A}} := \operatorname{span}\left\{B_j^m \,:\, j \in \mathcal{A}\right\},$$

$$\varphi_i := \sum_{h=0}^{n} p_h^x B_h^n - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}} r_j^x B_j^m - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{L}_i} l_x B_j^m - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{U}_i} u_x B_j^m.$$

In the previous article [6], we did not use the fact that consecutive subproblems are *quite similar*. Further on in this section, we describe the connection between the subproblems and solve them more efficiently than in [6].

At the beginning of the algorithm, we set

$$\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{U}_1 := \emptyset, \qquad \mathcal{F}_1 := \{\alpha+1, \alpha+2, \ldots, m-\beta-1\}$$

(see [6, Section 5, Step 1]). Therefore, in the first iteration, we have

$$\varphi_1 := \sum_{h=0}^{n} p_h^x B_h^n - \sum_{j\in\mathcal{C}} r_j^x B_j^m.$$

To solve the first subproblem, we start with the construction of the dual basis for the basis

$$\left\{B_{\alpha+1}^m, B_{\alpha+2}^m, \ldots, B_{m-\beta-1}^m\right\}$$

of the space $\Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_1}$, using Algorithm 2.5. Then, we use Fact 1.2 to obtain the best least squares approximation $\psi_1^* \in \Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_1}$ of φ_1.

Now, let us consider the ith subproblem ($i > 1$) and its relation with the previous one. There are two possibilities.

Case 1. One element q was transferred from $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ or $\mathcal{U}_{i-1}$ to $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ (see [6, Section 5, Step 2]). Therefore, we set $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \cup \{q\}$ and $((\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{L}_{i-1} \setminus \{q\} \wedge \mathcal{U}_i := \mathcal{U}_{i-1})$ or $(\mathcal{U}_i := \mathcal{U}_{i-1} \setminus \{q\} \wedge \mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{L}_{i-1}))$. According to (4.4), for the given $\varphi_i := \varphi_{i-1} + sB_q^m$ ($s = l_x$ or $s = u_x$), we look for the optimal element $\psi_i^* \in \Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_i}$. Obviously, we have

$$\left\{B_j^m \,:\, j \in \mathcal{F}_i\right\} = \{B_h^m \,:\, h \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}\} \cup \left\{B_q^m\right\}.$$

Taking into account that in the previous iteration the dual basis for the basis $\{B_h^m \,:\, h \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}\}$ of the space $\Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_{i-1}}$ was computed, we use Algorithm 2.4 to obtain the dual basis for the basis $\{B_j^m \,:\, j \in \mathcal{F}_i\}$ of the space $\Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_i}$. Then, we compute the optimal element using Fact 1.2.

Case 2. At least one element was transferred from $\mathcal{F}_{i-1}$ to $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ or $\mathcal{U}_{i-1}$ (see [6, Section 5, Step 5]). Apart from very rare cases, exactly one element q was transferred. If the rare case occurred, then the procedure given below should be applied repeatedly. We set $\mathcal{F}_i := \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \setminus \{q\}$ and $((\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{L}_{i-1} \cup \{q\} \wedge \mathcal{U}_i := \mathcal{U}_{i-1})$ or $(\mathcal{U}_i := \mathcal{U}_{i-1} \cup \{q\} \wedge \mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{L}_{i-1}))$. This time, we have $\varphi_i := \varphi_{i-1} - sB_q^m$ ($s = l_x$ or $s = u_x$) and, according to (4.4), we look for the optimal element $\psi_i^* \in \Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_i}$. One can see clearly that

$$\left\{B_j^m \,:\, j \in \mathcal{F}_i\right\} = \{B_h^m \,:\, h \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}\} \setminus \left\{B_q^m\right\}.$$

Now, since the dual basis for the basis $\{B_h^m \,:\, h \in \mathcal{F}_{i-1}\}$ of the space $\Pi_m^{\mathcal{F}_{i-1}}$ was computed in the previous iteration, we obtain the new dual basis using Algorithm 3.5 (cf. Case 1). Finally, we use Fact 1.2 to compute the optimal element.

Remark 4.4. Notice that φ_i ($i > 1$) only *slightly* differs from φ_{i-1} (see Cases 1 and 2). Similarly as in Corollaries 2.2 and 3.3, one can obtain formulas connecting the coefficients of the new optimal element ψ_i^* and the previous one ψ_{i-1}^*. In Case 2, the formula is simple, efficient and worth considering. For details, see our implementation in Maple$^{\mathrm{TM}}$13 available on the webpage `http://www.ii.uni.wroc.pl/~pgo/papers.html`.

Remark 4.5. In each iteration, the *older method* [6, Section 5 and Appendix] solves a system of normal equations, which can be associated with matrix inversion (cf. [6, (A.3)]). Observe that the new method avoids this. As we shall see in the next section, the approach given in this paper is also much more efficient.

5. Examples

In this section, we consider the problem of degree reduction of sixteen-segment composite Bézier curve "Octopus" (see Figure 1a). Notice that the original control points are located very close to the plot of the composite curve (see Figure 1b).

The results have been obtained on a computer with `Intel Core i5-3337U 1.8GHz` processor and `8GB` of `RAM`, using 16-digit arithmetic. Maple$^{\mathrm{TM}}$13 worksheet containing programs and tests can be found at `http://www.ii.uni.wroc.pl/~pgo/papers.html`. Text file with the control points of the composite Bézier curve "Octopus" is available as well.

We apply the algorithms independently to every segment of the composite curve. In each case, we use the sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=0}^N$ of equally spaced points for the least squares distance (4.1), i.e., we set $t_k := k/N$ ($k = 0, 1, \ldots, N$). In Table 1, we give the parameters, least squares errors E (see (4.1)) and maximum errors

$$E_\infty := \max_{t \in T_M} ||P_n(t) - R_m(t)|| \approx \max_{0 \le t \le 1} ||P_n(t) - R_m(t)||,$$

where $T_M := \{0, 1/M, 2/M, \ldots, 1\}$ with $M := 500$.

As a result of the traditional degree reduction, we obtain the composite curve with the control points shown in Figure 1c. Clearly, some of the control points are located far away from the plot of the curve (cf. Figure 1b).

Next, we solve Problem 4.1 using the new method from Section 4. For each resulting Bézier curve, the box constraints were chosen so that the searched control points are placed inside the rectangular area bounded by the outermost control points of the original corresponding Bézier curve. More precisely, we set

$$l_z := \min_{0\le k\le n} p_k^z, \qquad u_z := \max_{0\le k\le n} p_k^z \qquad (z = x, y).$$

The resulting composite curve with its control points is illustrated in Figure 1d. This time, the location of the control points is much more satisfying (cf. Figure 1c). However, because of the additional restrictions (4.3), the larger errors are unavoidable (see Table 1).

In Table 2, we give the comparison of total running times between the box-constrained degree reduction from [6, Section 5 and Appendix] and the new method (see Section 4). Clearly, the algorithm given in this paper is approximately two times faster than the older one.

	Input data						Traditional degree reduction		Problem 4.1	
	Curves	n	m	N	α	β	E	E_∞	E	E_∞
Octopus	Head: left side	9	7	20	2	1	5.07e−04	2.30e−04	5.72e−03	2.32e−03
	Head: right side	9	7	20	1	0	9.05e−05	5.12e−05	2.29e−03	8.86e−04
	1st arm: part 1	15	9	23	0	0	2.65e−04	1.58e−04	3.53e−03	1.40e−03
	1st arm: part 2	17	9	28	0	1	1.59e−03	7.86e−04	1.87e−03	8.92e−04
	2nd arm: part 1	14	10	26	1	0	1.62e−04	9.51e−05	1.32e−02	4.41e−03
	2nd arm: part 2	14	10	26	0	1	7.35e−05	3.54e−05	4.44e−03	2.44e−03
	3rd arm: part 1	13	7	25	1	1	2.50e−03	9.56e−04	2.62e−02	9.03e−03
	3rd arm: part 2	11	7	23	1	0	8.73e−04	5.13e−04	4.05e−03	1.62e−03
	4th arm	11	7	23	0	0	2.78e−03	1.47e−03	2.61e−02	1.01e−02
	5th arm	18	11	23	0	0	1.51e−04	2.91e−04	6.14e−03	2.41e−03
	6th arm: part 1	12	7	28	0	0	1.44e−03	6.37e−04	6.97e−03	2.71e−03
	6th arm: part 2	17	9	29	0	2	8.48e−04	5.16e−04	1.39e−02	4.26e−03
	7th arm: part 1	15	9	29	2	0	9.86e−04	3.60e−04	4.39e−03	1.81e−03
	7th arm: part 2	11	7	25	0	2	8.95e−04	3.54e−04	8.95e−04	3.54e−04
	8th arm: part 1	16	9	29	2	0	1.21e−03	4.44e−04	1.38e−02	4.66e−03
	8th arm: part 2	9	6	18	0	2	2.29e−03	1.05e−03	2.29e−03	1.05e−03

Table 1: The results of degree reduction of the composite Bézier curve "Octopus".

	Without the use of dual bases ([6])	With the use of dual bases (present paper)
Running times [s]	2.436	1.249

Table 2: Total running times of box-constrained degree reduction of the composite Bézier curve "Octopus". For the parameters, see Table 1.



Figure 1: Figure (a) shows the original composite Bézier curve "Octopus". Figure (b) presents the same composite curve as Figure (a) but with its control points. Figures (c) and (d) illustrate degree reduction of the original composite curve (blue solid line) to degree reduced composite curve (red dashed line with red and green control points), where each segment is (c) optimal solution of the traditional degree reduction, (d) optimal solution of Problem 4.1. The control points which are constrained by the continuity conditions (4.2) are green, while the other ones are red and restricted by (4.3). Parameters are specified in Table 1.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we introduce a new property of dual bases, which results in the novel method of their construction. The presented algorithm, along with the methods given in [23], can be used to solve efficiently the problem of degree reduction of Bézier curves with box constraints. The experiments show that the new iterative method of degree reduction is approximately two times faster than the previous one from [6]. Furthermore, in each iteration, we avoid solving a system of normal equations, which can be associated with matrix inversion.

References

[1] M. Bartoň, B. Jüttler, Computing roots of polynomials by quadratic clipping, Computer Aided Geometric Design 24 (2007), 125–141.

[2] P. Bogacki, S. E. Weinstein, Y. Xu, Degree reduction of Bézier curves by uniform approximation with endpoint interpolation, Computer-Aided Design 27 (1995), 651–661.

[3] Z. Ciesielski, The basis of B-splines in the space of algebraic polynomials, Ukrainian Mathematical Journal 38 (1987), 311–315.

[4] M. Eck, Least squares degree reduction of Bézier curves, Computer-Aided Design 27 (1995), 845–851.

[5] R. N. Goldman, Dual polynomial bases, Journal of Approximation Theory 79 (1994), 311–346.

[6] P. Gospodarczyk, Degree reduction of Bézier curves with restricted control points area, Computer-Aided Design 62 (2015), 143–151.

[7] P. Gospodarczyk, S. Lewanowicz, P. Woźny, $G^{k,l}$-constrained multi-degree reduction of Bézier curves, Numerical Algorithms (2015), accepted. Available at `http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11075-015-9988-3`.

[8] P. Gospodarczyk, P. Woźny, Merging of Bézier curves with box constraints, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 296 (2016), 265-274.

[9] Z. Guohui, L. Xiuping, S. Zhixun, A dual functional to the univariate B-spline, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 195 (2006), 292–299.

[10] B. Jüttler, The dual basis functions for the Bernstein polynomials, Advances in Computational Mathematics 8 (1998), 345–352.

[11] S. N. Kersey, Dual basis functions in subspaces of inner product spaces, Applied Mathematics and Computation 219 (2013), 10012–10024.

[12] M. Lachance, Approximation by constrained parametric polynomials, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics 21 (1991), 473–488.

[13] C. W. Lawson, R. J. Hanson, Solving Least Squares Problems, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1974.

[14] S. Lewanowicz, P. Woźny, Dual generalized Bernstein basis, Journal of Approximation Theory 138 (2006), 129–150.

[15] S. Lewanowicz, P. Woźny, Multi-degree reduction of tensor product Bézier surfaces with general boundary constrains, Applied Mathematics and Computation 217 (2011), 4596–4611.

[16] S. Lewanowicz, P. Woźny, P. Keller, Polynomial approximation of rational Bézier curves with constraints, Numerical Algorithms 59 (2012), 607–622.

[17] L. Lu, Explicit G^2-constrained degree reduction of Bézier curves by quadratic optimization, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 253 (2013), 80–88.

[18] L. Lu, Gram matrix of Bernstein basis: Properties and applications, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 280 (2015), 37–41.

[19] P. B. Stark, R. L. Parker, Bounded-Variable Least-Squares: an Algorithm and Applications, Computational Statistics 10 (1995), 129–141.

[20] H. Sunwoo, Matrix representation for multi-degree reduction of Bézier curves, Computer Aided Geometric Design 22 (2005), 261–273.

[21] H. Sunwoo, N. Lee, A unified matrix representation for degree reduction of Bézier curves, Computer Aided Geometric Design 21 (2004), 151–164.

[22] P. Woźny, Construction of dual bases, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 245 (2013), 75–85.

[23] P. Woźny, Construction of dual B-spline functions, Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics 260 (2014), 301–311.

[24] P. Woźny, P. Gospodarczyk, S. Lewanowicz, Efficient merging of multiple segments of Bézier curves, Applied Mathematics and Computation 268 (2015), 354–363.

[25] P. Woźny, S. Lewanowicz, Multi-degree reduction of Bézier curves with constraints, using dual Bernstein basis polynomials, Computer Aided Geometric Design 26 (2009), 566–579.